

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-04688-RS](#) (AGT)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 234

Plaintiffs want Google to produce documents that Google previously produced in *Brown v. Google LLC*, No. 20-cv-03664-YGR (N.D. Cal.), if the documents include the terms WAA, sWAA, or Firebase. Google seeks a protective order to excuse compliance with plaintiffs' request.

At this stage in the case, with over a year and a half of discovery in the books, and only two months to go before the fact-discovery cutoff, the undersigned is disinclined to allow another "parallel discovery track" to open. Dkt. 234 at 2. Plaintiffs have served over 190 RFPs, and the parties have painstakingly negotiated ESI custodians and search terms. Much ground has been covered, and plaintiffs haven't convincingly explained why, now, in spite of the discovery that has already taken place, the cross-production from *Brown* is needed.

Plaintiffs suggest that Google is shielding documents in *Brown* for a "sinister" reason, *id.* at 5, but no such showing has been made. Instead, it appears that Google is simply seeking to avoid "a never-ending train of productions from one case to the next." *Id.* at 4. Finding that the requested cross-production would, at this time, be disproportionate to the needs of the case, the undersigned grants Google's request for a protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 12, 2022



ALEX G. TSE
United States Magistrate Judge